

UNITED STATAS DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRS	T NAMED INVENTOR		ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/414,415	10/07/99	STANLEY		Ε	USDIV/PAT002
Γ	-	PM82/12	,, T		EXAMINER
LEE G MEYER			20	GROSZ	Z,A
PATTON BOGGS	LLP			ART	UNIT PAPER NUMBER
1660 LINCOLN DENVER CO 80		LIE 1900		3628	4
			• • • • •	DATE MA	NLED: 12/28/99

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks





Office Action Summary

	Application No. 69 444, 415	Applicant(s) STANLRY PT M	Applicant(s)	
Examiner Glon		Group Art Unit 3627		

The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover s	sheet beneath the correspondence address—
Period for Reply	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE $\underline{\mathcal{T}\mathcal{H}}$ OF THIS COMMUNICATION.	MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE
 Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statuto if NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MON Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application. 	ry minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this communication .
Status ,	
Responsive to communication(s) filed on	
☐ This action is FINAL .	
☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matter accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 1 1; 453 O	
Disposition of Claims	
\times Claim(s) 1-6, 8-14, 16, 17	is/are pending in the application.
Of the above claim(s)	is/are withdrawn from consideration.
Claim(s)	is/are allowed
(Claim(s) 1-6, 8-14, 16 7 17	is/are rejected.
☐ Claim(s)	
□ Claim(s)	
Application Papers	·
☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-94	48.
☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on is ☐ app	• •
☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are objected to by the Exam	miner.
☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.	
☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)	•
 □ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 1 □ All □ Some* □ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority docum □ received. 	. , . ,
 □ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) □ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau 	
*Certified copies not received:	•
Attachment(s)	
	□ Intentiew Summant PTO-413
☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s).	Interview Summary, 1 10-415
☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948 (ARPONE)	☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-15

U. S. Patent and Trademark Office PTO-326 (Rev. 9-97)

Part of Paper No.

Application/Control Number: 09/414,415

Art Unit: 3628

In response to this action, applicant is urged to submit a <u>PTO 1449</u>, listing the prior art of the parent application.

The first few lines on top of page 1 must be "amended" to provide the complete and correct parent applications data.

In claim 7, line 2, "liquid-like" must be changed to-liquid-.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321© may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-6, 8-14, 16, 17 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-9 of U.S. Patent No. 5,991,948 in view of Yuen et al or Elkins. It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have used a thermal regulating unit with Stanley et al's device, because Yuen et al and Elkins recognize the desirability of thermal regulating units with a similar body support, in order to improve the comfort of a user.

Hall, Tyrey and Gammous et al, teaching the use of thermal regulating units, are cited as relevant art.

Art Unit: 3628

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Examiner A. Grosz at telephone number (703) 308-2498.

Grosz/ph

December 21, 1999

ALEXANDER GROSZ PRIMARY EXAMINER